



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

But it is the political folly of such a policy that the author most emphasizes. He is fully conscious of the fact that there is widespread and deep-seated distrust and dislike of malefactors of great territory, as there is of malefactors of great wealth. England belongs to both classes, and should so shape her course as to avoid drawing fire. "The future greatness and grandeur of the British Empire requires a policy of world-friendliness and not world-defiance." The author gives a unique turn to the argument by pointing out that England by means of the interest on her four billions of investments abroad, half of it outside the Empire, is able to secure a vast amount of imports for which no visible exports are exchanged—"unearned imports" he aptly calls them. They grew enormously during the quarter-century prior to the war, and they must in time of depression cause more or less of irritation among debtor nations; and that irritation ought not to be increased by a trade policy that would in effect say: Keep your products but pay your interest promptly. The book was written for a purpose by a man who really believes in the doctrine of freedom.

GEORGE O. VIRTUE

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

American Charities. By AMOS G. WARNER. Revised by MARY ROBERTS COOLIDGE. Third Edition. New York: Crowell, 1919. Pp. xxii+541. \$2.50.

"On the appearance of Warner's *American Charities* fourteen years ago its unique character was at once recognized; for that work is the first thoroughgoing scientific treatment of the most difficult and perhaps the most important of the ever-widening group of sociological arts to which happily Professor Henderson has given the generic name of 'social technology.'" With these words Professor Howard opens the biographical preface to this third edition.

For nearly a generation *American Charities* has been the handbook of a certain group of students in this field of social investigation. Without much question it was the best general work on the subject in 1894, when it first appeared; but in the quarter of a century just past there have been tremendous changes in the understanding of our dependents, in the attitude toward them, and in practical methods of relief work. Consequently there has been for some time a need for restating the whole group of problems relating to poverty. The question is: Should this statement be a revision of old formulas or should it be from a new approach? Mrs. Coolidge has decided upon the former course, and

has made a second revision of Warner's original book. She defines her task thus:

The reviser has been careful not to alter the distinctive color which Professor Warner gave to the book and which has made it a classic in its field. Warner saw what was permanent and vital with humorous common-sense, and to an exceptional degree. In a few instances only has it been necessary to modify the conclusions laid down by him, but two entirely new chapters have been added to round out his discussion of poverty. The changes made by the reviser consist in the substitution of more recent figures and illustrations and the addition of 25,000 words of new material. . . .

No attempt has been made to include new movements in social welfare except when they might serve to illustrate Warner's text; nor to take account of the changes which war will bring about in philanthropy. This third edition, necessarily somewhat inconsistent, is rededicated to Professor Warner.

To speak of the book as somewhat inconsistent is well within the facts. To the careful reader it is painfully inconsistent. The book is neither Warner nor Mrs. Coolidge. Thus chapter iii is utterly out of harmony with chapter v. In the former seven statistical tables classify poverty in terms of "worthiness" and "unworthiness," "misconduct" and "misfortune," etc. This chapter leaves the impression that causal factors operate singly, and that it is possible to state with exactness down to the tenths of 1 per cent the proportion of poverty that is due to drink, laziness, old age, unemployment, etc. Then with one leap a totally different point of view is presented in chapter v. "The attempt to attribute the social career of an individual to heredity on the one hand or to circumstances on the other and to apportion to each an approximate per cent of influence is seen to be fallacious." The author might have attempted to rid the reader of some preconceptions in the very raising of such questions as, "Is poverty a misfortune or a fault?" Some discussion of these matters would then have been worth while, but only by way of showing the futility of the question itself. Even that result, however, might perhaps be just as well attained by ignoring the outgrown problem.

The question inevitably arises: Is a task such as Mrs. Coolidge set for herself worth while? If Warner's original book was admittedly "a classic in the field," why should anyone tamper with it? Would it not be better to let that work stand as a milestone of progress in philanthropic effort rather than to carry it along as a burden to the present and the future? Would not Mrs. Coolidge's energy have been expended more wisely in stating the problems as she sees them at

the present with her own hypotheses? What the reviser has done seems hardly justified, whether we regard *American Charities* as a sacred book or as a simple contribution to one stage of social development.

Among the things which a textbook on charities may do are the following: (1) It may present case histories to bring out both causal factors and methods of social service. (2) It may present philanthropy as a function of the general social life, changing with the development of commerce and industry, religion, science, and democracy. (3) It may present statistically and descriptively causal factors with reference to community programs for the prevention of poverty. (4) It may present methods of organization, administration, and supervision, the business aspect of charities.

The book hardly pretends to accomplish either the first or the second of these ends. The third possibility is undertaken in a manner that has already been shown to be inconsistent and confusing. The fourth is done fairly well, although there is little more than passing reference to such agencies as the Cleveland Federation, the Transportation Agreement, the Confidential Exchange, or the Illinois Department of Public Welfare.

In form and workmanship the book is above reproach. Nevertheless under the circumstances it seems doubtful if the work was worth doing.

STUART A. QUEEN

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

The Frontiers of Language and Nationality in Europe. By LEON DOMINIAN. New York: Henry Holt & Co. 1917. Pp. xviii+375.

From the main thesis of Mr. Dominian's book there can be no reason for dissenting. His contention is that, as a practical matter, national frontiers can best be distinguished by linguistic characteristics, and, as a general rule, boundary lines should follow the separation of languages. There are exceptions to the rule, to be sure; there is Belgium, Switzerland, and even Alsace-Lorraine, where many German-speaking communities are "nationally" French; or the Eastern Adriatic coast, where Jugo-Slav nationalists sing of Serbian hopes in the language of their enemies, the Italians. Linguistic boundaries are not the best, but they are the least troublesome at present. There is the additional nuisance that adjoining linguistic areas are apt to be divided by a strip of a bilingual population. Yet this is true only of the cities and more populous